

Appn. No. 10/671,210  
Amendment dated September 26, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 24, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet, which includes Figs. 3 and 4, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 3 and 4.

Attachment: One Replacement Sheet

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appn. No. 10/671,210  
Amendment dated September 26, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 24, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 5 through 10 remain in this application. Claims 2 through 4 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. Claims 11 through 20 have been added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Part 1 of the Office Action

The drawings have been objected to.

Submitted with this response is a drawings sheet with an amended Figure 3 in which the element 11 has been changed to include the holes 15 that are shown in the top rim. Further, it is submitted that the reference number "21" is shown in Figure 4 at the lower end. In any event, the replacement sheet that is being submitted with this response includes the reference number "21" at the bottom of the tape cartridge 17.

In light of the proposed drawing amendment, it is therefore submitted that the objection to the drawings as originally filed has been overcome, and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Part 2 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (first paragraph) as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

This rejection in the Office Action generally inquires into the reason that the tape strips stick to one another in the cartridge, but are then able to be released to stick to the surface against which they are contacted. It is

Appln. No. 10/671,210  
Amendment dated September 26, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 24, 2005

submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art understands that, much like a section of a roll of tape may be peeled from the remainder of the roll, the tape strips may be treated with a release material on the backside of the tape. The reason that tape can be relatively easily peeled from itself but is not easily from a surface against which the adhesive is contacted is the presence of that release material on the backside of the tape, which allows the next layer of tape to stick to the lower layer, but not in an overly "sticky" manner. The degree to which the stacked coils or segments will stick to each other corresponds to the amount of release substance applied to the backside of the tape, and the amount of effort required to remove the segments from each other may varied by the same mechanism. In contrast, the surface to which the "sticky" side of the bottommost strip of tape is contacted with (such as paper) is not likely to have any release material on it, and thus the adhesive of the bottommost piece of tape sticks to the surface more aggressively and strongly than the adhesive of the second-to-the-bottommost piece of tape sticks to the release applied to the back of the bottommost piece of tape. While there may be some surfaces that the adhesive of the bottommost tape segment might not stick (just as there are some surfaces on which any tape will not stick), common surfaces such as paper will typically stick to the adhesive on the tape more aggressively than the stacked pieces of tape will stick to each other.

Withdrawal of the §112 (first paragraph) rejection of claims 1 through 10 is respectfully requested.

**Parts 2 and 3 of the Office Action**

Claims 1 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bardini.

Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bardini.

Appln. No. 10/671,210  
Amendment dated September 26, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 24, 2005

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claims 2 through 4, which was indicated as being allowable over the prior art, and therefore claim 1, as well as claims 5 through 9, are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1 and 9 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Part 4 of the Office Action:**

Claim 10 has been indicated as being allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, set forth in the Office Action. In light of the remarks made above with respect to the §112 question, it is submitted that claim 10 is allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
Customer No. 40,158  
P.O. Box 5027  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027  
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357

Date:

*26 SEP 2005*

BEST AVAILABLE COPY